

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/992,149

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

N. M. Minnifield

Art Unit

1645

**All Participants:**

- (1) N. M. Minnifield.  
(2) David Schwartz, 48211.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

- (3) Robert Brown;  
Marc Mansour.  
(4) Warwick Kimmins.

**Date of Interview:** 26 May 2004**Time:** 9:15 am**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 obviousness rejection

Claims discussed:

1-13 and 15

Prior art documents discussed:

Nash et al 1985 (J. Reprod. Immunol., 7:151-162); Alving et al (6110492); Glenn et al (5980898); Gupta et al (Vaccine, 1993, 11/13:293-306) and Edelman et al (Intenà. Rev. Immunol., 1990, 7/1:51-66) All references are of record.

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
N. M. MINNIFIELD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
5/27/04

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It is noted that Applicants' after final amendment filed May 10, 2004 would be entered. Claims 1-13 and 15 are now pending in the present application. Applicants reviewed the claimed invention and discussed how the claimed invention is different from the composition that would be made by one of ordinary skill in the art using the teachings of the combination of references. The declaration was discussed and the tables reviewed. The Examiner indicated that as a result of the comments and data set forth in the amendment and declaration (in particular Table B) respectively that the 103 obviousness rejection would be withdrawn. Claims 1-13 and 15 have been allowed and renumbered 1-14 respectively. .